

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/877,757	Applicant(s) VARRIANO-MARSTON, ELIZABETH6	
	Examiner Marc A Patterson	Art Unit 1772	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Marc A Patterson.

(3) Elizabeth Varriano Marston EVM

(2) Scott Asmus SJA

(4) [Signature]

Date of Interview: 7/29/04

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: The packaging of the claimed invention of the prior art.

Claim(s) discussed: all of the record

Identification of prior art discussed: all of the record

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _____.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

The claimed invention vs the prior art of record, specifically what limitations could be added to Claim 1 to distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art of record. It was determined that limitations regarding hole size, flux & further definition of the target area may distinguish the claimed invention. A demonstration was also provided of the claimed and prior art packaging, to show that the prior art packaging does not achieve its stated objective. On this point, a declaration may be submitted in support.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Marc Patterson
Examiner's signature, if required